



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/828,896	04/20/2004	Clement B. Edgar III	PA716D1C1	5845
23696	7590	12/05/2008	EXAMINER	
QUALCOMM INCORPORATED			HOM, SHICK C	
5775 MOREHOUSE DR.				
SAN DIEGO, CA 92121			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2416	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/05/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

us-docketing@qualcomm.com
kascanla@qualcomm.com
nanm@qualcomm.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/828,896	Applicant(s) EDGAR ET AL.	
	Examiner SHICK C. HOM	Art Unit 2416	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 July 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 12-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 11, 15-18 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 11 is objected to because of the following informalities: In claim 11 lines 2-3, the word "an unexpected sequence number" seem to refer back to the "unexpected sequence number" recited in claim 10 line 8. If this is true, it is suggested changing "an unexpected sequence number" to ---the unexpected sequence number---. Appropriate correction is required.

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re*

Art Unit: 2416

Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 1-9 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-7 of U.S. Patent No. 6,266,540. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the application's claim 1 merely broaden the scope of the U.S. Patent no. 6,266,540 claim 1 by eliminating

the transceiver that communicates with a central station being a radio antenna unit in a wireless communications system;

wherein said interface bus interface transceiver and said desk-sets exchange packets over said interface bus, each packet comprising: an address (ADDR) byte that includes source and destination addresses of the packet; a command (CMD) byte; an

Art Unit: 2416

argument (ARG); and a block check character (BCC) for error checking; and

wherein said BCC is produced by a longitudinal parity check.

The limitation eliminated in the application's independent claim 1; namely, wherein said interface bus interface transceiver and said desk-sets exchange packets over said interface bus, each packet comprising: an address (ADDR) byte that includes source and destination addresses of the packet; a command (CMD) byte; an argument (ARG); and a block check character (BCC) for error checking is now merely recited in the application's dependent claim 2; and

wherein said BCC is produced by a longitudinal parity check is now merely claimed in the application's dependent claim 3.

Likewise the scope of U.S. Patent no. 6,266,540 dependent claim 2 which recite wherein each packet further comprises a start of header (SOH) byte that indicates the start of the packet is now recited in application's dependent claim 5;

Claim 3 which recite wherein said interface bus comprises a pair of conductors is now recited in application's dependent claim 6;

Claim 4 which recite wherein said interface bus comprises an unshielded twisted pair is now recited in application's dependent claim 7;

Claim 5 which recite wherein said interface bus comprises an EIA- 485 interface is now recited in application's dependent claim 8.

Therefore, the application's claims 1-3 and 5-8 merely broaden the scope of the U.S. Patent no. 6,266,540 claim 1-5 by eliminating the transceiver that communicates with a central station being a radio antenna unit in a wireless communications system.

Likewise, the application's claims 4 and 9 merely broaden the scope of the U.S. Patent no. 6,266,540 claims 6-7 by eliminating the transceiver that communicates with a central station being a radio antenna unit in a wireless communications system.

5. Claims 10 and 12-14 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,724,753. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the application's

Art Unit: 2416

claim 10 merely broaden the scope of the U.S. Patent

No. 6,724,753 claim 1 by eliminating the

the step of sending a reboot command from the common node to said one of the terminals when the number of missed packets exceeds a predetermined threshold;

the step of sending a reboot command from the common node to said one of the terminals when a NAK is received at the common node from said one of the terminals; and

the steps of: determining that a packet is new when the sequence number in the current packet is one greater than the sequence number in the previous packet; determining that a packet is repeated when the sequence number in the current packet equals the sequence number in the previous packet; determining that a packet is repeated when the sequence number in the current packet is N less than the sequence number in the previous packet, where N is a predetermined threshold; and detecting a bad sequence number otherwise. However, omitted step of sending a reboot command due to exceeded threshold and when a NAK is received is now recited in dependent claims 12 and 13, respectively, and the steps of determining packet is new or repeated is now recited in dependent claim 14.

It has been held that the omission of a element and its function is an obvious expedient if the remaining elements

Art Unit: 2416

perform the same function as before. In re Karlson, 136 USPQ (CCPA). Also note Ex parte Rainu, 168 USPQ 375 (Bd. App. 1969); omission of a reference element whose function is not needed would be obvious to one skilled in the art.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Menon et al. (6,208,627).

Regarding claim 1:

Menon et al. disclose the telephone apparatus, comprising:
a transceiver that communicates with a central station (the
abstract recite the telephone apparatus including interface with

Art Unit: 2416

a radio transceiver for communication with the central telephone switch);

a plurality of desksets (Fig. 1 shows a plurality of desksets 102); and

an interface bus that permits said desksets to communicate with said transceiver by exchanging packets with the transceiver, each packet including source, destination and error checking information (Figs. 1, 4, and col. 14 line 64 to col. 15 line 15 shows and recite the interface bus, data transmitted and received being packet data including cyclic redundancy checks; further col. 20 lines 32-36 recite error correction information being transmitted and col. 48 lines 51 to col. 49 line 4 recite filling the called address field of the packet, i.e. destination information).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

9. Claims 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Menon et al. (6,208,627) in view of Azarya et al. (5,978,578).

For claims 6-9, Menon et al. disclose the telephone apparatus described in paragraph 7 of this office action. Menon et al. disclose all the subject matter of the claimed invention with the exception of wherein said interface bus comprises a pair of conductors as in claim 6; wherein said interface bus comprises an unshielded twisted pair as in claim 7; wherein said interface bus comprises an EIA-485 interface as in claim 8; and

Art Unit: 2416

wherein a media access layer of said interface bus is carrier sense multiple access with collision detect as in claim 9.

Azarya et al. from the same or similar fields of endeavor teach coupling between networks whereby it is known to provide wherein said interface bus comprises a pair of conductors; wherein said interface bus comprises an unshielded twisted pair; wherein said interface bus comprises an EIA-485 interface; and wherein a media access layer of said interface bus is carrier sense multiple access with collision detect (col. 12 line 63 recite the use of a bus in a network being a twisted pair cable and using CSMA for bus arbitration and col. 16 lines 50-56 recite the use of EIA-485 bus).

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide wherein said interface bus comprises a pair of conductors; wherein said interface bus comprises an unshielded twisted pair; and wherein said interface bus comprises an EIA-485 interface; and wherein a media access layer of said interface bus is carrier sense multiple access with collision detect as taught by Azarya et al. in the apparatus of Menon et al.

The interface bus comprising a pair of conductors; wherein said interface bus comprises an unshielded twisted pair; wherein

Art Unit: 2416

said interface bus comprises an EIA-485 interface; and wherein a media access layer of said interface bus is carrier sense multiple access with collision detect can be implemented by using the pair of conductors; wherein said interface bus comprises an unshielded twisted pair; and wherein said interface bus comprises an EIA-485 interface and using CSMA of Azarya et al. for connecting the terminals and transceiver of Menon et al.

The motivation for providing the interface bus comprising a pair of conductors; wherein said interface bus comprises an unshielded twisted pair; and wherein said interface bus comprises an EIA-485 interface; and wherein a media access layer of said interface bus is carrier sense multiple access with collision detect as taught by Azarya et al. in the communication apparatus of Menon et al. being that it provides more efficiency for the system since the system uses lower cost pair of conductors, i.e. an unshielded twisted pair, as a bus for connecting the terminals and more efficiency for the system because it uses a well-known standard bus, i.e. EIA-485 bus interface, for communication and CSMA standard for bus arbitration.

Allowable Subject Matter

Art Unit: 2416

10. Claims 11 and 15-18 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the objection(s) set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Harris, Jr. et al. disclose coupling between non-CTOS host and CTOS network.

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 2416

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SHICK C. HOM whose telephone number is (571)272-3173. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Pham Chi can be reached on 571-272-3179. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Chi H Pham/
Supervisory Patent
Examiner, Art Unit 2416

SH